APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/450,813	11/29/1999	PAUL A. ROGERS	ACTUP0002	8209

22434	7590	12/30/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER
DODDS, HAROLD E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/450,813	ROGERS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Harold E. Dodds, Jr.	2177

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Harold E. Dodds, Jr.*.   (3)_____.

(2) *Tiffinay Bell*.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: *12 December 2003*.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
            c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
      If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *None*.

Identification of prior art discussed: *None*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.   g)☐ was not reached.   h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *Ms. Bell telephoned and asked whether the last Office Action on patent application 09/450,813 was a Final or Non-Final Office Action. This was a Non-Final Office Action. Since the Office Action included the form paragraph "THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL..." she requested that a Supplemental Action with this paragraph removed be FAXed to Elise Heilbrunn, attorney for the applicant* .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.   Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record
A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews
Paragraph (b)
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.
All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:
– Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
– Name of applicant
– Name of examiner
– Date of interview
– Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
– Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
– An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
– An identification of the specific prior art discussed
– An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
– The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:
1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
2) an identification of the claims discussed,
3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner.
5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
    (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

SUPPLEMENTAL OFFICE ACTION

The following is a Supplemental Office Action to replace the Non-Final Office

Action, which was mailed on 26 November 2003. A copy of this action was sent via FAX

to the attorney for the applicants.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2.   Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 28, 29 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over McIntosh (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,576), Shisler et al (U.S.

Patent Application No. 2001/0018708), and Schaefer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,826,268).

3.   McIntosh rendered obvious independent claims 1 and 28 by the following:

"...will cause a data break..." at p. 8, par. 0112.

"...that has been retrieved from the data source..." at p. 4, par. 0080 and p. 4, par. 0074.

"...causes a data break..." at p. 8, par. 0112.

"...at the page level..." at p. 4, par 0078.

"...at the page level for the pages..." at p. 4, par 0078.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use data breaks in a report in order to start over at the top of a page whenever the classification changes for the items being listed. Likewise, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use data sources to obtain classification information about the contents of information contained in these data sources in order to have a reliable source of this information.

Shisler does not teach the use of security tags.

5.   However, Schaefer teaches the use of security tags as follows:

"...forming a first security tag..." col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...associating the first security tag..." col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...having the first security tag..." col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...until a second security tag is formed..." col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...based on a plurality of security tags..." col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...associated with the plurality of security tags..." col. 8, lines 53-55.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use security tags in order to have a convenient method of marking data according to its security classification.

6.   As per claim 2, the "...report is generated from one executable

component...," is taught by Shisler at par. 5.

7.   As per claims 3 and 29, the "...forming a first security tag...," is taught by

Schaefer at col. 11, lines 32-35,

the "...comprises retrieving a security identifier..." is taught by Schaefer at col. 4, lines

25-27,

the "...for each data break...," is taught by Shisler at p. 8, par. 0112,

the "...from the data source...," is taught by Shisler at p.4, par. 0074,

the "...wherein each data break...," is taught by Shisler at p. 8, par. 0112,

the "...is associated with one or more security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at col.

4, lines 25-27,

the "...combining the one or more security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 4,

lines 25-27,

and the "...creating a first security tag...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-55.

8.   As per claim 8, the "...sorting the data from the data source...," is taught by

Shisler in Figure 21,

the "...based on one or more data breaks...," is taught by Shisler at p. 8, par. 0112,

the "...wherein a data break...," is taught by Shisler at p. 8, par. 0112,

and the "...is caused by a change in category of the data...," is taught by Shisler at p. 13,

par. 0150.

9.   As per claim 9, the "...a data break..., is taught by Shisler at p. 8, par 0112

and the "...is a level break in the data...," is taught by Shisler in Figure 7.

10.   As per claim 35, the "...a data break is a level break in the data...," is taught by Shisler at p. 8, par. 0112 and p. 3, par. 0071.

11.   As per claim 36, the "...security information...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 39, lines 14-17

and the "...comprises one or more database fields..., is taught by McIntosh at col. 24, lines 35-39 and col. 22, lines 61-64.

12.   As per claim 37, the...," security information...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 39, lines 14-17,

and the "...comprises information indicating one or more levels of access to the data...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 7, lines 38-42 and col. 21, line 40.

13.   Claims 4, 5, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntosh, Shisler, and Schaefer as applied to claims above, and further in view of Hellend et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,666).

As per claims 4 and 30, the "...from a security system...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 19, lines 58-60,

the "...with a data row...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 39, lines 10-11,

the "...mapping the one or more security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 3, lines 60-65 and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...in the first security tag...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...adopted from the security system...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 19, lines 58-60,

the "...creating a security tag adaptable...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...by the security system...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 19, lines 58-60,

the "...and associating the security tag...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...adaptable by the security system...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 19, lines 58-60,

the "...to a page in the report...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

but the "...associating a role adopted...,"

and the "...with one or more roles...," is not taught by either McIntosh, Shisler, or

Schaefer.

However, Helland teaches the mapping of roles as follows:

"...the installer maps the roles to the security configuration
of the computer system on which the server application is
installed, such as to specific user ids and groups..." at col.
2, lines 59-61.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to associate roles with security identifiers in order to provide a convenient

mechanism for relating specific users with specific information contained in the reports.

14.   As per claim 5, the "...security system...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 19,

lines 58-60,

the "...has a plurality of roles...," is taught by Helland at col. 2, lines 59-61,

and the "...a plurality of users...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14.

15.   Claims 6 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over McIntosh, Shisler, Schaefer, and Hellend as applied to claims 4 and

28 above respectively, and further in view of Asmuth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,272,767).

As per claims 6 and 31, the "...in the retrieved data row...," is taught by McIntosh

at col 39, lines 10-11,

the "...upon which a data break is based...," is taught by Shisler at p. 8, par. 0112,

the "...in the security system...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 19, lines 58-60,

but the "...identifying a data column...,"

and the "...identifying one or more roles that...correspond to the data column...," are not

taught by either McIntosh, Shisler, Schaefer, or Hellend.

However, Asmuth teaches the association of roles with columns as follows:

> "...These two columns are associated with roles that the columns
> of input table 11 may play in the generation of output table 13
> as performed by the tool represented by icon 17..." at col. 3,
> lines 33-36.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to associate roles with columns in order to provide flexibility in the use of the

system.

16.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McIntosh, Shisler, Schaefer, Hellend, and Asmuth as applied to claim 6 above, and

further in view of Crapo (U.S. Patent No. 5,629,846).

As per claim 7, the "...to map the one or more roles...with the data column...," is

taught by Asmuth at col. 3, lines 33-36,

the "...in the security system...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 19, lines 58-60,

but the "...deriving translation rules...," is not taught by either McIntosh, Shisler,

Schaefer, Hellend, or Asmuth.

However, Crapo teaches the use of translation rules for mapping as follows:

> "...The translation rules are used for mapping the entire source
> document to the target document..." at col. 2, lines 13-14.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use translation rules to map the roles to columns in order to provide a systematic and consistent method of assigning roles to the columns.

17.   Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntosh, Shisler, and Schaefer as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lermuzeaux et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,621,889) and Kenworthy (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,837).

As per claim 10, the "...determining a first role in a security system that corresponds directly to the user...,"

the "...determining one or more secondary roles that correspond indirectly to the user...,"

the "...combining the first role with the one or more secondary roles...,"

and the "...creating a security clearance for the user...," are not taught by McIntosh, Shisler, or Schaefer.

However, Lermuzeaux teaches the use of a security system which uses roles associated with users as follows:

"...The intrusion detection facility of the invention whose software architecture is shown in FIG. 1 is more particularly designed to be associated with a computer installation in the context of a security system designed to protect said computer installation from intrusions by users..." at col. 3, lines 13-17.

"...The mission analyzer referenced 120 is defined to verify that the tasks which are current for a user under consideration in the computer installation 1 correspond to the missions specified by the roles specific to that user..." at col. 10, lines 19-22.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to determine roles that correspond to users in order to establish a systematic

and convenient means of defining which users will have access to specific data.

Lermuzeaux does not teach the use of security clearances.

However, Kenworthy teaches the use of security clearances as follows:

```
"...it may be desirable to establish varying levels of security
clearance, such that only certain authorized users of the LAN
are permitted to access a particular NAD server..." at col. 1,
lines 52-54.
```

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use security clearances in order to further define a systematic and

convenient means of defining which users will have access to specific data.

18.   As per claim 11, the "...comparing the security clearance...," is taught by

Kenworthy at col. 1, lines 52-54,

the "...for the user...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 21, lines 62-65,

the "...with one or more of the plurality of security tags...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8,

lines 53-55,

and the "...to derive a subset of pages in the report that can be viewed by the user...," is

taught by McIntosh at col. 5, 43-46 and col. 28, lines 13-14.

19.   Claims 12, 13, 23-25, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over McIntosh, Schaefer, and Jebens (U.S. Patent No. 6,332,146).

20.   McIntosh rendered obvious independent claims 12 and 32 by the

following:

"...retrieving a report..." at col. 34, lines 55-58.

"...having a superset of pages..." at col. 28, lines 13-14.

"...one or more pages from the superset of pages..." at col. 28, lines 13-14.

"...are associated with the superset of pages of the report..." at col. 28, lines 13-14.

"...associated with the user..." at col. 28, lines 13-14.

"...associated with the user..." at col. 28, lines 13-14.

"...associated with superset of pages of the report..." at col. 28, lines 13-14.

"...deriving a subset of pages..." at col. 5, lines 43-46 and col. 28, lines 13-14.

"...from the superset of pages based on the comparison..." at col. 28, lines 13-14 and col. 6, lines 35-38.

"...such that the subset of pages..." at col. 5, lines 43-46 and col. 28, lines 13-14.

"...associated with the report..." at col. 27, line 50.

McIntosh does not teach the use of security tags and security identifiers and allowing users to view only the data they are authorized to view.

21.   However, Schaefer teaches the use of security tags and security identifiers as follows:

"...having a security tag..." at col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...associated therewith such that a plurality of security tags..." at col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...obtaining a list of security identifiers..." at col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...comparing the list of security identifiers..." at col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55.

"...with a plurality of security tags..." at col. 8, lines 53-55.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use security tags and security identifiers in order to have a convenient method of marking data according to its security classification.

Schaefer does not teach allowing users to view only the data they are authorized to view.

22.   However, Jebens teaches allowing users to view only the data they are authorized to view as follows:

"...only contains data that the user is authorized to view..." at col. 13, lines 6-7.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to allow user to view only the information they are authorized to view in order to maintain the security of the information.

23.   As per claim 13, the "...presenting the subset of pages as a report to the user...," is taught by Mcintosh at col. 28, lines 13-14.

24.   As per claim 23, the "...list of security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55

and the "...is derived from a security system...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 19, lines 58-60.

25.   As per claim 24, the "...determining a commonality between one of the plurality of security tags...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 7, lines 31-33 and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...associated with the superset of pages of the report...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...and the list of security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 10, lines 40-41

and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...associated with the user...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...including a page of the superset of pages...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28,

lines 13-14,

the "...in the subset of pages...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 5, lines 43-46 and col. 28,

lines 13-14,

the "...if the one of the plurality of security tags...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines

53-55,

the "...and the list of security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 10, lines 40-41

and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...associated with the user...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

and the "...pass the threshold level of commonality when compared...," is taught by

Schaefer at col. 9, lines 53-56 and col. 7, lines 26-33.

     26.   As per claim 25, the "...threshold level of commonality...," is taught by

Schaefer at col. 9, lines 53-56 and col. 7, lines 26-33,

the "...is having one term...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 5, lines 43-46,

the "...in the one of the plurality of security tags...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 2, lines

28-30 and col. 7, lines 26-33

and the "...list of security identifiers in common...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 10, lines

40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55.

27.   Claims 15-17, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over McIntosh, Schaefer, and Jebens as applied to claims above, and

further in view of Decker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,745,560).

As per claims 15 and 33, the "...represents a page the user is authorized to

view...," is taught by Jebens at col. 13, lines 6-7,

the "...represents a viewable page...," is taught by Jebens at col. 13, lines 6-7,

but the "...creating a first page map having a first plurality of complete cells for the

superset of pages wherein a complete cell represents a page...,"

the "...determining whether a cell from the first plurality of complete cells...,"

and the "...creating a second page map having a second plurality of partial cells wherein

a partial cell...," are not taught by either McIntosh, Schaefer, or Jebens.

However, Decker teaches the use of page maps and cells as follows:

"...The page map contains a memory cell (i.e. one binary bit)
for each of the page's many PEL areas..." at col. 2, lines 55-
56.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use page maps designating cells to indicate whether users are authorized

to view pages in order to have a compact means of designating which pages particulars

users may view.

28.   As per claims 16 and 34, the "...comparing the list of security identifiers...,"

is taught by Schaefer at col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...associated with the user...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, line 13-14,

the "...with a plurality of security tags...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...associated with the superset of pages of the report...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...associating a value with each one of the first plurality of complete cells...," is taught by Decker at col. 2, lines 55-56,

and the "...based on whether the user can view a particular page...," is taught by Jebens at col. 13, lines 6-7.

29.   As per claim 17, the "...examining the content...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 46-51

and the "...one of the first plurality of complete cells...," is taught by Decker at col. 2, lines 55-56.

30.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntosh, Schaefer, Jebens, and Decker as applied to claims above, and further in view of Warmus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,452).

As per claim 20, the "...from the first page map...," is taught by Decker at col. 2, lines 55-56,

the "...in a page in the report...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 27, line 50,

the "...corresponding to a page in the superset of pages...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...that the user is authorized to view...," is taught by Jebens at col. 13, lines 6-7,

the "...inserting a partial page number...," is taught by Warmus at col. 43, lines 7-9,

the "...into a page number component...," is taught by Warmus at col. 43, lines 7-9,

and the "...partial page number...," are not taught by either McIntosh, Schaefer, Jebens,

or Decker.

However, Warmus teaches the use of page numbers as follows:

"...A page number--The page number is the sequential number of
the page description in the merged PostScript™ file 450 of the
page to be rendered..." at col. 43, lines 7-9.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to number the pages in the report sequentially in order to produce a more

attractive report and to remove from report the original pagination so that the user is not

able to determine how much information he/she is not authorized to view.

31.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McIntosh, Schaefer, and Jebens as applied to claims above, and further in view of

Warmus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,452).

As per claim 26, the "...deriving content information...," is taught by Schaefer at

col. 8, lines 46-51,

the "...related to the subset of pages...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 5, lines 43-46 and

col. 28, lines 13-14,

but the "...including page numbers...," s not taught by McIntosh, Schaefer, or Jebens.

However, Warmus teaches the use of page numbers as follows:

"...A page number--The page number is the sequential number of
the page description in the merged PostScript™ file 450 of the
page to be rendered..." at col. 43, lines 7-9.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to number the pages in the report sequentially in order to produce a more

attractive report and to remove from report the original pagination so that the user is not able to determine how much information he/she is not authorized to view.

32.   Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntosh, Schaefer, Jebens, and Decker as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Rangarajan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,365).

As per claim 18, the "...creating a partial page map cell that corresponds to a complete cell...," is taught by Decker at col. 2, lines 55-56,

the "...representing a page in the report...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...corresponding to the complete cell into the partial cell...," is taught by Decker at col. 2, lines 55-56,

but the "...inserting a first page map index value...," is not taught by either McIntosh, Schaefer, Jebens, or Decker.

However, Rangarajan teaches the use of page map indexes as follows:

```
"...Each index value unit represents the total number of
elements in a index page map..." at col. 7, lines 47-48.
```

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use a page map index values to designate the pages of information that a user is authorized to view in order to have compact means of designating which pages particulars users may view.

33.   As per claim 19, the "...inserting a second page map index value...," is taught by Rangarajan at col. 7, lines 47-48

and the "...into a complete cell...," is taught by is taught by Decker at col. 2, lines 55-56.

34.   Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over McIntosh, Schaefer, and Jebens as applied to claim 15 above, and

further in view of Shisler.

As per claim 21, the "...comparing the list of security identifiers...," is taught by

Schaefer at col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...associated with the user...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...with the plurality of security tags...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...associated with the superset of pages of the report...," is taught by McIntosh at

col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...with security identifiers in the list of security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at

col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...in each of the plurality of security tags...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-

55,

the "...with one or more security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-

55,

the "...associated with the user...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...in the list of security identifiers...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 10, lines 40-41

and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...associated with the user...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

but the "...mapping one or more level break identifiers...," is not taught by either

McIntosh, Schaefer, or Jebens.

However, Schisler teaches the use of level breaks as follows:

"...If not, processing returns to fetch 705 another level break
specification. If the current level being processed is
determined to be at a data break, child section processing 708
takes place as detailed in connection with FIG. 10, and
processing then fetches 705 the next level break
specification..." at p. 8, par. 0112.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use level break identifiers in order to provide a convenient means of

identifying the break levels when organizing the report pages for printing a report

containing only the information a user is authorized to view.

35.   As per claim 22, the "...comparing the list of security identifiers...," is

taught by Schaefer at col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55,

the "...further comprises comparing the level break identifiers...," is taught by Shisler at

p. 8, par. 0112,

the "...in one of the plurality of security tags...," is taught by Schaefer at col. 8, lines 53-

55,

the "...with the security identifiers in the list of security identifiers...," is taught by

Schaefer at col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55,

and the "...associated with the user...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14.

36.   Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McIntosh, Schaefer, Jebens, and Warmus as applied to claim 26 above, and further in

view of Shisler.

As per claim 27, the "...content information only contains information related to

the subset of pages...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

the "...of the subset of pages...," is taught by McIntosh at col. 28, lines 13-14,

wherein each of the plurality of security tags

but the "...and generally reflects a level break structure...,"

and the "...is associated with a level break...," are not taught by either McIntosh,

Schaefer, Jebens, or Warmus.

However, Schisler teaches the use of level breaks as follows:

"...If not, processing returns to fetch 705 another level break
specification. If the current level being processed is
determined to be at a data break, child section processing 708
takes place as detailed in connection with FIG. 10, and
processing then fetches 705 the next level break
specification..." at p. 8, par. 0112.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use level break in order to provide a convenient and orderly means of

organizing the report pages for printing a report containing only the information a user is

authorized to view.

Allowable Subject Matter

37.   Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

38.   Applicants' arguments filed 15 September 2003 have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive. In the first argument for independent claims 1

and 28 and claims 3 and 29 on page 10, paragraph 3, the Applicants state:

"McIntosh neither discloses nor suggests "retrieving a data row and associated security
information from a data source, the data row having data to be contained in the report,"
"forming a first security tag from the security information that has been retrieved from

the data source if the data row causes a data break," "associating the first security tag with a new page in the report wherein the data row is placed on the new page such that security is implemented at the page level for the new page in the report," or "placing subsequent data rows on pages having the first security tag associated therewith until a second security tag is formed such that data in the report is organized based on a plurality of security tags such that security is implemented at the page level for the pages associated with the plurality of security tags," as recited in claim 1, as amended. For instance, the security information may include one or more security identifiers, as recited in claim 3."

A combination of references from McIntosh, Shisler, and Schaefer renders obvious independent claims 1 and 28. McIntosh teaches "retrieving a data row" at col. 39, lines 10-11, "and associated security information" at col.33, lines 14-17, "the data row having data" at col. 39, lines 10-11, and "to be contained in the report" at col. 27, line 50 and Shisler teaches "from a data source" at p. 4, par. 0074. Schaefer teaches "forming a first security tag" col. 8, lines 53-55, McIntosh teaches "from the security information" at col.33, lines 14-17 and "if the data row " at col. 39, lines 10-11, and Shisler teaches "that has been retrieved from the data source" at p. 4, par. 0080 and p. 4, par. 0074 and "causes a data break" at p. 8, par. 0112. Schaefer teaches "associating the first security tag" col. 8, lines 53-55, McIntosh teaches "with a new page in the report" at col. 28, lines 13-14, "the data row" at col. 39, lines 10-11, "is placed on the new page" at col. 28, lines 13-14, "such that security is implemented" at col. 33, lines 14-17, "for the new page in the report" at col. 28, lines 13-14, and Shisler teaches "at the page level" at p. 4, par 0078. Mcintosh teaches "placing subsequent data rows" at col. 39, lines 10-11, "on pages..." at col. 28, lines 13-14, "such that data" at col. 39, lines 10-11, "in the report is organized" at col. 27, line 50, and "such that security is implemented" at col. 33, lines 14-17, Schaefer teaches "having the first security tag" col. 8, lines 53-55, "until a second

security tag is formed" col. 8, lines 53-55, "based on a plurality of security tags" col. 8,

lines 53-55, and "associated with the plurality of security tags" col. 8, lines 53-55, and

Shisler teaches "at the page level for the pages" at p. 4, par 0078. For claims 3 and 29,

Schaefer teaches "forming a first security tag" at col. 11, lines 32-35 and "combining

the one or more security identifiers" at col. 4, lines 25-27.

39.   In the second argument for independent claims 1 and 28 on page 11,

paragraph 4, the Applicants state:

"As set forth above, Nessett discloses a security information list in which each tagged
component includes a tag, which identifies a security mechanism. The security
information list merely lists security mechanisms supported by the server. Therefore,
this list is static rather than dynamic. The cited references neither disclose nor suggest
associating security tags with data (e.g., pages in a report)."

Applicants' arguments with respect to independent claims 1 and 28 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Nessett

reference has been replaced with the Schaefer reference. This argument appears to be

a restatement of part of the first argument and for this reason was answered in the

response to the first argument.

40.   In the third argument for independent claims 1 and 28 and claims 10 and

11 on page 12, paragraph 1, the Applicants state:

"The cited references, separately or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest
associating a security tag with a new page in a report wherein the data row is placed on
the new page. Moreover, the cited references, separately or in combination, fail to
disclose or suggest placing subsequent data rows on pages having the first data tag
until a second security tag is formed such that data in the report is organized based on
a plurality of security tags. Similarly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest
comparing security information associated with a user with such security tags in order to
ascertain which pages of a report are viewable by the user (e.g., claims 10 and 11)."

Most of the third argument appears to be a restatement of portions of the first argument

and for this reason was answered in the response to the first argument. For the portion

of this argument for claims 10 and 11, McIntosh teaches the "for the user" is taught by

at col. 21, lines 62-65 and "to derive a subset of pages in the report that can be viewed

by the user" col. 5, 43-46 and col. 28, lines 13-14 and Schaefer teaches "with one or

more of the plurality of security tags" at col. 8, lines 53-55.

41.   In the fourth argument for independent claims 12 and 32 on page 12,

paragraph 4, the Applicants state:

"McIntosh does not teach the use of security tags, security identifiers or allowing users
to view only the data they are authorized to view."

Schaefer teaches "having a security tag" at col. 8, lines 53-55 and "obtaining a list of

security identifiers" at col. 10, lines 40-41 and col. 8, lines 53-55 and Jebens teaches

"only contains data that the user is authorized to view" at col. 13, lines 6-7.

42.   In the fifth argument for independent claims 12 and 32 on page 12,

paragraph 4, the Applicants state:

"Nessett neither discloses nor suggests associating security tags with data or pages
within a report. Moreover, Nessett neither discloses nor suggests retrieving a report
having a superset of pages, a page from the superset of pages having a security tag."

Applicants' arguments with respect to independent claims 1 and 28 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Nessett

reference has been replaced with the Schaefer reference. McIntosh teaches "retrieving

a report" at col. 34, lines 55-58, "having a superset of pages" at col. 28, lines 13-14, and

"one or more pages from the superset of pages" at col. 28, lines 13-14 and Scheafer

teaches "having a security tag" at col. 8, lines 53-55.

43.   In the sixth argument for independent claims 12 and 32 on page 12,

paragraph 4, the Applicants state:

"Jebens fails to disclose or suggest associating security tag with a page in a resort or, alternatively retrieving a page in a report based upon an associated security tag. It is also important to note that Jebens implies that an authorized user may view entire reports rather than specific portions (or pages) within a report."

McIntosh teaches "one or more pages from the superset of pages" at col. 28, lines 13-

14 and Scheafer teaches "having a security tag" at col. 8, lines 53-55. McIntosh teaches

"retrieving a report" at col. 34, lines 55-58, "having a superset of pages" at col. 28, lines

13-14, and "one or more pages from the superset of pages" at col. 28, lines 13-14 and

Scheafer teaches "having a security tag" at col. 8, lines 53-55. While the Jebens

reference when taken by itself might imply that an authorized user may view entire

reports, this reference when used in context with the McIntosh and Schaefer references

strongly imply an authorized user may view specific portions (or pages) within a report.

44.   In the seventh argument for independent claims 12 and 32 on page 13,

paragraph 1, the Applicants state:

"Thus, the cited references, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "retrieving a report having a superset of pages, a page one or more pages from the superset of pages having a security tag associated therewith such that a plurality of security tags are associated with the superset of pages of the report," "obtaining a list of security identifiers associated with the user," "comparing the list of security identifiers associated with the user with a the plurality of security tags associated with the superset of pages of the report," and "deriving a subset of pages from the superset of pages based on the comparison such that the subset of pages only contains data that the user is authorized to view" as recited in claim 12, as amended."

A combination of references from McIntosh, Schaefer, and Jebens renders obvious

independent claims 12 and 32. McIntosh teaches "retrieving a report" at col. 34, lines

55-58, "having a superset of pages" at col. 28, lines 13-14, "one or more pages from the

superset of pages" at col. 28, lines 13-14, "are associated with the superset of pages of

the report" at col. 28, lines 13-14 and Schaefer teaches "having a security tag" at col. 8,

lines 53-55 and "associated therewith such that a plurality of security tags" at col. 8,

lines 53-55. Schaefer teaches "obtaining a list of security identifiers" at col. 10, lines 40-

41 and col. 8, lines 53-55 and "associated with the user" at col. 28, lines 13-14.

Schaefer teaches "comparing the list of security identifiers" at col. 10, lines 40-41 and

col. 8, lines 53-55 and "with a plurality of security tags" at col. 8, lines 53-55 and

McIntosh teaches "associated with the user" at col. 28, lines 13-14 and "associated with

superset of pages of the report" at col. 28, lines 13-14. McIntosh teaches "deriving a

subset of pages" at col. 5, lines 43-46 and col. 28, lines 13-14, "from the superset of

pages based on the comparison" at col. 28, lines 13-14 and col. 6, lines 35-38, "such

that the subset of pages" at col. 5, lines 43-46 and col. 28, lines 13-14, and "associated

with the report" at col. 27, line 50 and Jebens teaches "only contains data that the user

is authorized to view" at col. 13, lines 6-7.

Conclusion

45.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Harold E. Dodds, Jr. whose telephone number is

(703)-305-1802. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 -

4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (703)-305-9790. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-

305-3900.

Harold E. Dodds, Jr.

Harold E. Dodds, Jr.
Patent Examiner
December 22, 2003

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER